DANIEL G. BOGDEN United States Attorney PHILLIP N. SMITH, JR. Assistant United States Attorney Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse 333 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 5000 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 388-6336 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between Daniel G. Bogden, United States Attorney, and Phillip N. Smith, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, counsel for the United States of America, and Heidi A. Ojeda, Assistant Federal Public Defender, counsel for Defendant CHARLES EDWARD COOPER, that the date for the Government to file a response to the Defendant's Objections to the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation (Docket #52) be extended for ten (10) days.

This stipulation is entered for the following reasons:

1. The Defendant's Objections were filed and served on March 30, 2015. Undersigned counsel for the Government was preparing for a jury trial in the matter of *United States v. Acevedo-Hernandez et al.*, 2:14-cr-242-JCM-VCF, which was scheduled to commence on April 13, 2015. On April 10, 2015, the Court continued the trial date.

	II.		
1	Due to the press of business	involved with undersigned counsel for the	
2	Government's involvement in <i>United States v. Acevedo-Hernandez et al.</i> , Government counse		
3	has not had adequate time to fully brief the issues contained within the Defendant's Objections.		
4	3. The Defendant is incarcerated, but he does not object to the continuance of the		
5	Government's response deadline.		
6	4. The additional time requested herein is not sought for purposes of delay, but		
7	merely to allow the Government adequate time to prepare an appropriate response to the		
8	Defendant's Objections.		
9	5. Additionally, denial of this request for continuance could result in a miscarriage		
10	of justice.		
11	6. This is the first stipulation filed	herein to continue the Government's response	
12	deadline.		
13	DATED: April 16, 2015.		
14	14		
15	$ \begin{array}{c c} & \frac{/s}{} \\ \hline & PHILLIP N. SMITH, JR. \\ \hline & HEID \end{array} $	/s/ DI A. OJEDA	
16		stant Federal Public Defender	
17		nsel for Defendant CHARLES COOPER	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	11		

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	2:14-CR-00228-JAD-CWH
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
·)	
v.)	
)	
CHARLES EDWARD COOPER,		
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

FINDINGS OF FACT

Based on the pending Stipulation of counsel, and good cause appearing therefore, the Court finds that:

- 1. The Defendant's Objections were filed and served on March 30, 2015. Undersigned counsel for the Government was preparing for a jury trial in the matter of *United States v. Acevedo-Hernandez et al.*, 2:14-cr-242-JCM-VCF, which was scheduled to commence on April 13, 2015. On April 10, 2015, the Court continued the trial date.
- 2. Due to the press of business involved with undersigned counsel for the Government's involvement in *United States v. Acevedo-Hernandez et al.*, Government counsel has not had adequate time to fully brief the issues contained within the Defendant's Objections.
- 3. The Defendant is incarcerated, but he does not object to the continuance of the Government's response deadline.

- 4. The additional time requested herein is not sought for purposes of delay, but merely to allow the Government adequate time to prepare an appropriate response to the Defendant's Objections.
- 5. Additionally, denial of this request for continuance could result in a miscarriage of justice.
- 6. This is the first stipulation filed herein to continue the Government's response deadline.

For all of the above-stated reasons, the ends of justice would best be served by a continuance of the response deadline.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The additional time requested herein is not sought for purposes of delay, but merely to allow the Government adequate time to prepare a response to the Defendant's Objections, taking into account due diligence. The failure to grant said continuance would likely result in a miscarriage of justice.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, that the previously-scheduled response deadline for the Government to respond to the Defendant's Objections to the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation (Docket #52) is extended until April 27, 2015.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE